UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,840	10/06/2003	Kevin Nip		1147

7590   09/14/2007

Kevin Nip
5742 Ross St.
Vancouver, BC V5W 3L4
CANADA

EXAMINER
KANE, CORDELIA P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/678,840	NIP, KEVIN
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Cordelia Kane	2132	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _08 August 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _24-46_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _24-46_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   It is assumed that applicants arguments for claim 1 were intended to be for claim

24 since claim 1 is cancelled. For the same reason it is assumed that the arguments for

claims 2 – 16 were intended to be for claims 25 – 39 and for claims 17 – 23 were for

claims 40 – 46.

2.   Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed August 8, 2007, with respect to the

rejections of claims 24 – 39 under 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a

new grounds of rejection is made.

3.   With respect to claims 40 – 46 applicant has not actually amended these claims

to be significantly different to the original claims 17 – 23 nor has he provided any

argument.

Claim Objections

4.   Claims 41 – 46 are objected to because of the following informalities: each claim

refers to the method of claim 40, when claim 40 is a system claim. Appropriate

correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

    1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

    2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

    3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

    4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
       obviousness or nonobviousness.

7.   Claims 24 – 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Steele et al. (Us Patent 7016877) and Soong (US Patent 6941271) and further in view

of Kanaishi et al (US PgPub 2003/0115489). Referring to claim 24, Steele teaches:

    a.   Generating a unique Requestor Identifier for each authenticated

Requestor and storing said Requestor Identifier in a data storage medium having

a plurality of Requestor Identifiers (column 7 lines 35-39 and column 16 lines 52-

62);

    b.   Accepting at least one sign-up specification record and storing said sign-

up record or group of records and Requestor identifier in a data storage medium

(column 15 lines 16-57 and fig. 4);

c.   Accepting at least one logon specification record and storing said logon

record or group of records and Requestor identifier in a data storage medium

(column 15 lines 16-57 and fig. 4);

d.   Accepting input from End-users including Requestor identifier and using

the sign-up specification record or records associated with the said Requestor

identifier in the manipulation of End-user data (column 16 line 46-column 17 line

45); and

e.   Accepting input from End-users including Requestor identifier and using

the logon specification record or records associated with the said Requestor

identifier in the manipulation of End-user data (column 16 line 46-column 17 line

45).

8.   Steele does not explicitly disclose including a unique logon or sign-up identifier.

However, Soong discloses:

f.   Storing a login identifier with the record (column 6, lines 29-30). It does not

specifically mention that the login ID is stored but it would have to be stored for

the computer to be able to check for it in the database.

g.   Accepting as input from the end-user the login ID and using it in

conjunction with the requestor ID to access and manipulate the end-user data

(column 6, lines 20-25).

9.   Steele and Soong are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor, accessing records. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Steele and Soong before him or

her, to modify the login process of Steele to include the login ID of Soong. The

motivation for doing so would have been to associate the user with their role (Soong,

claim 2).

10.   The Examiner notes that Steele doesn't specifically disclose the embodiment of

a separate sign-up receiving component and a logon receiving component. Steele

discloses similar functionality wherein a single component performs the manipulation of

data using both the logon and sign-up records. The Examiner argues that it would have

been an obvious modification to include separate components for the manipulation of

data. It appears that it is a design choice whether to implement the functionality in a

single component or multiple components. Thus the Examiner argues that it would

have been readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that the functionality of

Steele could have been embodied with separate components.

11.   In addition, Kanaishi also discloses the required components discussed above

(see [0040] – [0047]). The Examiner adds Kanaishi as a supplemental reference and

not necessarily to overcome any deficiencies in Steele.

12.   As per claim 25, Steele discloses the manipulation of data is verifying input data

(column 16 line 63 – column 17 line 5).

13.   As per claim 26, Steele discloses the manipulation of data is placing data in a

data storage medium (column 18 lines 6-17).

14.   As per claim 27, Steele discloses the manipulation of data is sending data in an

electronic mail message (column 11 lines 54-65).

15.   As per claim 28, Steele discloses the sign-up specification record is data field
information (see fig. 3 and 4).

16.   As per claim 29, Steele discloses the sign-up specification record is field display
information (column 14 lines 27-47).

1.   As per claim 30, Steele discloses the sign-up specification record is
authentication information (column 15 lines 36-49).

17.   As per claim 31, Steele discloses the sign-up specification record is an input
parameter (column 15 lines 44-47).

18.   As per claim 32, Steele discloses the logon specification record is data field
information (see fig. 3 and 4).

19.   As per claim 33, Steele discloses the logon specification record is field display
information (column 14 lines 27-47).

20.   As per claim 34, Steele discloses the logon specification record is authentication
information (column 15 lines 36-49).

21.   As per claim 35, Steele discloses the logon specification record is an input
parameter (column 15 lines 44-47).

22.   As per claim 36, Steele discloses the manipulation of data is the retrieval of an
element of data previously stored using the sign-up receiving component (column 17
lines 18-34).

23.   As per claim 37, Steele discloses the manipulation of data is the display of data
in a data display medium (column 17 lines 18-34).

24.   As per claim 38, Steele discloses setting an authentication token that completes

the authentication of the End-user (column 11 line 43 – column 12 line 3).

25.   As per claim 39, Steele the Requestor and the End-user are the same (column

17 lines 55-57) wherein in the update process the requestor and end-user would be the

same.

2.   Claims 40 – 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Steele et al. (Us Patent 7016877) and Kanaishi et al (US PgPub 2003/0115489).

Referring to claim 40, Steele teaches:

   a.   a data storage medium storing information for a plurality of Requestors

   and End-users (column 16 line 52 to column 17 line 5);

   b.   a Requestor identifier assignment component providing a receiving

   component for receiving requests to generate a Requestor identifier, a Requestor

   identifier assignment component which generates a unique associated

   Requestor identifier for each Requestor, and a Requestor identifier fulfillment

   component that completes the input of the Requestor identifier information into

   the data storage medium (column 7 lines 35-39 and column 16 lines 52-62);

   c.   a Requestor data sign-up specification component providing a receiving

   component for receiving requests to input Requestor sign-up information

   including an indication of one of the plurality of Requestors and a Requestor

   sign-up fulfillment component that completes the input of the Requestor sign-up

information together with the associated Requestor identifier into the data

storage medium (column 15 lines 16-57 and fig. 4);

d.   a Requestor data logon specification component providing a receiving

component for receiving requests to input Requestor logon information including

an indication of one of the plurality of Requestors and a Requestor logon

fulfillment component that completes the input of the Requestor logon information

together with the associated Requestor identifier into the data storage medium

(column 15 lines 16-57 and fig. 4);

e.   an End-user data sign-up component providing a receiving component for

receiving requests to input End-user information including an indication of the

Requestor identifier and a data retrieval component that retrieves from the data

storage medium information for the indicated Requestor identifier including at

least one Requestor sign-up information record and uses the retrieved

information to manipulate the End-user data (column 16 line 46-column 17 line

45);

f.   and an End-user data logon component providing a receiving component

for receiving requests to authenticate End-user information including an

indication of the Requestor identifier and a data retrieval component that

retrieves from the data storage medium information for the indicated Requestor

identifier including at least one Requestor logon information record and uses the

retrieved information to manipulate the End-user data (column 16 line 46-column

17 line 45).

26.   The Examiner notes that Steele doesn't specifically disclose the embodiment of

a separate sign-up receiving component and a logon receiving component. Steele

discloses similar functionality wherein a single component performs the manipulation of

data using both the logon and sign-up records. The Examiner argues that it would have

been an obvious modification to include separate components for the manipulation of

data. It appears that it is a design choice whether to implement the functionality in a

single component or multiple components. Thus the Examiner argues that it would

have been readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that the functionality of

Steele could have been embodied with separate components.

27.   In addition, Kanaishi also discloses the required components discussed above

(see [0040] – [0047]). The Examiner adds Kanaishi as a supplemental reference and

not necessarily to overcome any deficiencies in Steele.

28.   As per claim 41, Steele discloses an End-user authentication fulfillment

component that completes the authentication of the End-user information by setting an

authentication token (column 11 line 43 – column 12 line 3).

29.   As per claim 42, Steele discloses the manipulation of data is the retrieval of an

element of data previously stored using the sign-up receiving component (column 17

lines 18-34).

3.   As per claim 43, Steele discloses the manipulation of data is placing data in a

data storage medium (column 18 lines 6-17).

4.   As per claim 44, Steele discloses the manipulation of data is sending data in an

electronic mail message (column 11 lines 54-65).

5.   As per claim 45, Steele discloses the manipulation of data is the display of data

in a data display medium (column 17 lines 18-34).

30.   As per claim 46, Steele discloses the Requestor and the End-user are the same

(column 17 lines 55-57) wherein in the update process the requestor and end-user

would be the same.

Conclusion

31.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cordelia Kane whose telephone number is 571-272-

7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CPK

Cordelia Kane
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2132

GILBERTO BARRON JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100